

## AGENDA

### TIP Review Work Group – Mtg. 12

Friday, July 15, 2016

1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Conference Room – 1<sup>st</sup> floor, West side

1. Call to Order
2. June 30, 2016 - Meeting Summary  
(Attachment A)
3. Continue discussion on guidelines for subregional funding allocation process.  
(Attachment B)
4. Discussion on guidelines for the remaining overall process of the Dual TIP Selection Model.  
(Attachment C)
5. Adjournment

Upcoming meeting dates

August 19<sup>th</sup>

Persons in need of auxiliary aids or services, such as interpretation services or assisted listening devices, are asked to contact DRCOG at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting by calling (303) 480-6744.



## ATTACHMENT A

### MEETING SUMMARY TIP REVIEW WORK GROUP – Mtg. 11

Thursday, June 30, 2016 - 1:00 p.m.

#### PARTICIPANTS PRESENT:

Jeanne Shreve	Adams County
Kent Moorman	Adams County, City of Thornton
Bryan Weimer	Arapahoe County
Mac Callison	Arapahoe County, City of Aurora
George Gerstle (Chair)	Boulder County
Danny Herrmann	CO Dept. of Transportation
David Gaspers	Denver, City and County
Steve Cook	DRCOG
Doug Rex	DRCOG
Mike Salisbury	Environmental
Art Griffith	Douglas County
John Cotten	Douglas County, City of Lone Tree
Dave Baskett	Jefferson County, City of Lakewood
Ted Heyd	TDM/Non-motorized
Janet Lundquist	Weld County

Others Present: Aaron Bustow, FHWA

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Will Soper, Brad Calvert, Casey Collins

#### Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

#### May 13, 2016 Summary

The summary was accepted as written.

---

#### **Discussion on meeting dates**

The group agreed that all future meeting will be held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Friday of the month at 1:30 p.m. The next meeting will be July 15.

#### **Follow-up discussion on guidelines for the regional funding allocation process**

Todd Cottrell presented two follow-up topics on the regional funding allocation process. The general takeaways of the work group's discussion are summarized as follows:

#### Question 1 –Regional project definition?

- The work group revised the definition that was included within the agenda packet to:

*Selected regional TIP projects should directly address Board-adopted TIP focus areas through a systems-approach focused on enhancing regional connections, regardless of travel mode. Regional projects should connect communities; improve mobility and access while providing a high return on investment to the region consistent with Metro Vision.*

Question 2 – Return on investment (ROI) Concepts for Projects

- ROI concepts must be reliable as they are used to compare regional projects.
- The current TIP criteria contain many ROI concepts, but are there other criteria to consider?
- Hard to decide on ROI criteria without the Board deciding on focus areas for the TIP first.
  - A wholesale review of ROI could then proceed after Board definition (possibly a function of the TIP Policy Workgroup).
- Evaluate different investment approaches on how well they help the region accomplish Metro Vision.

**Discussion on guidelines for the sub-regional funding allocation process**

Todd Cottrell presented seven topics for discussion on the sub-regional funding allocation process. The work group only had available time to discuss four of those topics. The general takeaways of the discussion are summarized as follows:

Question 1 – How should the subregional geographic areas be defined?

- There was a general consensus of the work group that counties would be best subregional geographic unit since it is already defined and a good working relationship exists between the municipalities within them. However, written concurrence from FHWA would be needed to confirm if this concept is allowed.
- Could make an argument that travel sheds may be a good geographic unit due to some smaller counties (Weld and Broomfield) or cities within multiple counties (Aurora).

Question 2 - How should funding allocations to sub-regions be calculated?

- The work group agreed that some combination of population, employment, and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) or person miles traveled (PMT) was the most appropriate.
- Staff agreed to bring the most recent data for these variables (and others if possible) listed by county to the next meeting.

Question 3 - What guidelines should be established for the subregional forums?

- Each subregional forum would be made up of local government elected officials or their delegates. Regional agencies (CDOT, RTD) would be non-voting.
- DRCOG staff will be utilized to monitor proceedings and review project proposals for federal eligibility.

Question 4 - Project/program eligibility

- All projects/programs must be consistent with Metro Vision principles and TIP Policy.
- Board may decide to put “curbs” on what is/isn’t eligible for a TIP call.

The remaining three subregional allocation process topics will be discussed at the July 15 meeting due to time constraints.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

## ATTACHMENT B

To: TIP Review Work Group  
From: Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner  
303 480-6737 or [tcottrell@drcog.org](mailto:tcottrell@drcog.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
July 15, 2016	Discussion	3

### SUBJECT

Continue discussion on considerations and guidelines for the subregional funding allocation component of the Dual Model.

### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

### ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

### SUMMARY

At the July 15 meeting, the work group will continue a discussion on the remaining topics related to subregional funding allocation shown in Attachment B-1. At the last meeting, the work group discussed four of the seven topics.

The work group also requested updated information used to calculate geographic equity in the 2016-2021 TIP. Staff will have available at the meeting the latest population, employment and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and/or person miles traveled (PMT) by county.

### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

### PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

### ATTACHMENT

B-1 Subregional Funding Allocation Process Discussion

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Todd Cottrell, at 303-480-6737 or [tcottrell@drcog.org](mailto:tcottrell@drcog.org).

# ATTACHMENT B-1

## Subregional Funding Allocation Process Discussion

(as presented at the June 30, 2016 Work Group)

### Sub-Regional Funding Allocation

1. How should the subregional geographic areas be defined?
  - a. By county?
  - b. By logical subarea using specific factors (population, travel patterns, etc)?
2. How should funding allocations to sub-regions be calculated?
  - a. i.e., population, employment, VMT, other . . . .a combination of variables?
3. What guidelines should be established for the subregional forums? (“forums” will be responsible for recommending projects to the DRCOG Board)
  - a. Participation/membership structure
    - i. All local governments invited to participate on forum
    - ii. Other eligible entities?
    - iii. Should regional agencies (CDOT, RTD, RAQC) be involved in the governance?
  - b. Forum procedures (e.g., public comment/participation, consensus/voting)
  - c. Level of DRCOG staff involvement
4. Project/Program eligibility
  - a. Project/programs eligible in DRCOG’s current TIP?
  - b. Anything that’s federally eligible?
5. Project selection procedures
  - a. Competitive process
    - i. Specific core criteria to be used by all subregions (e.g. Metro Vision, environmental justice, ADA)?
    - ii. Technical evaluations?
      1. Problem definition (volume, congestion, connectivity, filling gaps, etc.)
      2. Likely benefits (usage, ridership, delay reduction, crash reduction, etc.)
      3. Other related beneficial elements: (multimodal components, connections to transit, etc.)
    - iii. Subregional-specific criteria (beyond core criteria)?
  - b. Eligible entities (e.g. local governments, state, and regional agencies)?
6. How to incorporate (or not) project type targets (x% to capacity, x% to bike/ped, etc...)?
7. How to incorporate consideration of funding program types (CMAQ, TAP, and STP-Metro)?

## ATTACHMENT C

To: TIP Review Work Group  
From: Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner  
303 480-6737 or [tcottrell@drcog.org](mailto:tcottrell@drcog.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
July 15, 2016	Discussion	4

### SUBJECT

Discussion on considerations and guidelines for the overall process component of the Dual Model.

### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

### ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

### SUMMARY

Over the last few meetings, staff presented background information and conceptual topics related to the Dual TIP Project Selection Model. The Dual Model topics fell into three general categories: the regional funding allocation, the subregional funding allocation and the overall dual model process.

As time permits, staff would like to begin discussion on the last topic, the overall process. Attachment C-1 spells out some specific questions for discussion.

### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

### PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

### ATTACHMENT

C-1 Overall Process Discussion

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Todd Cottrell, at 303-480-6737 or [tcottrell@drcog.org](mailto:tcottrell@drcog.org).

## ATTACHMENT C-1

### Overall Process Topics to be Addressed by Work Group

(July 15, 2016)

#### Overall Dual Model Process

1. What **sequence/schedule** should be followed regarding establishment of:
  - a. Set-asides/Pools
  - b. Regional project/program allocation
  - c. Sub-regional forum recommendations
  
2. How should the funding distribution between **regional and sub-regional allocations** be determined?
  - a. Subregional allocation determined after regional projects selected?
  
3. When should the Board adopt focus areas for the TIP?